arXiv:1510.00638v1 [math.NT] 2 Oct 2015

PELL NUMBERS WITH LEHMER PROPERTY

BERNADETTE FAYE FLORIAN LUCA

Abstract. In this paper, we prove that there is no number with the Lehmer property in the sequence of Pell numbers.

1. Introduction

Let $\phi(n)$ be the Euler function of a positive integer n. A composite integer has the Lehmer property if $\phi(n) \mid n-1$. Lehmer [7] conjectured that there are no such numbers. For a positive integer m, we write $\omega(m)$ for the number of distinct prime divisors of m. Lehmer proved that if N has his property, then $\omega(N) \geq 7$. This result has been improved by Cohen and Hagis in [3] to $\omega(N) \geq 14$. The current record $\omega(N) \geq 15$ is due to Renze [10]. In case where $3 \mid N$, Bursci et al. [2] proved that $\omega(N) \geq 40 \cdot 10^6$ and $N > 10^{36 \cdot 10^7}$.

Many results concerning this problem can be found in the litterature (see [1], [9]). Not succeeding in proving that there are no numbers with the Lehmer property, some researchers concentrated on proving that there are no numbers with the Lehmer property in certain interesting subsequences of positive integers like in the Fibonacci sequence $\{F_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ and its companion sequence $\{L_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ (see [5] and [8]). In [4] and [6], it was shown that there are no numbers with the Lehmer property in the sequence of Cullen numbers $\{C_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ of general term $C_n = n2^n + 1$, and in some appropriate generalization of the sequence of Cullen numbers, respectively.

Here, we use the same argument as in [8] to show that there is no number with the Lehmer property in the Pell sequence $\{P_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ given by $P_0 = 0, P_1 = 1$ and $P_{n+2} = 2P_{n+1} + P_n$ for all $n \geq 0$. As with other Lucas sequences, the Pell sequence has a companion $\{Q_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ given by $Q_0 = 2, Q_1 = 2$ and $Q_{n+2} = 2Q_{n+1} + Q_n$ for all $n \geq 0$. There are no numbers with the Lehmer property in the companion sequence $\{Q_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ either, but this trivially follows from the fact Q_n is even for all $n \geq 1$.

Our result is the following:

Theorem 1. *There is no Pell number with the Lehmer property.*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11B39; Secondary A25.
Key words and phrases. Pell numbers, Euler function.

2. Preliminary results

Let $(\alpha, \beta) = (1+\sqrt{2}, 1-\sqrt{2})$ be the roots of the characteristic equation $x^2 - 2x - 1 = 0$ of the Pell sequence $\{P_n\}_{n\geq 0}$. The Binet formula for P_n is

$$P_n = \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\alpha - \beta} \quad \text{for all} \quad n \geq 0. \tag{1}$$

This implies easily that the inequality

$$P_n \geq 2^{n/2} \tag{2}$$

hold for all $n \geq 2$. Additionally, the Binet formula for Q_n is

$$Q_n = \alpha^n + \beta^n \quad \text{for all} \quad n \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

There are several relations among Pell and Pell-Lucas numbers which are well-known and can be proved using the Binet formula (1) for the Pell numbers and its analog (3). We only use the following well-known results.

Lemma 2. *The relation*

$$Q_n^2 - 8P_n^2 = 4(-1)^n \tag{4}$$

holds for all $n \geq 0$. Further, if n is odd, then

$$P_n - 1 = \begin{cases} P_{(n-1)/2}Q_{(n+1)/2} & \text{if} \quad n \equiv 1 \pmod 4; \\ P_{(n+1)/2}Q_{(n-1)/2} & \text{if} \quad n \equiv 3 \pmod 4. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

For a prime p and a nonzero integer m let $\nu_p(m)$ be the exponent with which p appears in the prime factorization of m. The following result is well-known and easy to prove.

Lemma 3. *The relations*

(i) $\nu_2(Q_n) = 1$,
(ii) $\nu_2(P_n) = \nu_2(n)$

hold for all positive integers n.

3. Proof of the Theorem

Let us recall that if N has the Lehmer property, then N has to be odd and square-free. In particular, if P_n has the Lehmer property for some positive integer n, then Lemma 3 (i) shows that n is odd. One checks with the computer that there is no number P_n with the Lehmer property with $n \leq 200$. So, we can assume that $n > 200$. Put $K = \omega(P_n) \geq 15$.

From relation (5), we have that

$$P_n - 1 = P_{(n-\epsilon)/2}Q_{(n+\epsilon)/2} \quad \text{where} \quad \epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

By Theorem 4 in [9], we have that $P_n < K^{2^K}$. By (2), we have that $K^{2^K} > P_n > 2^{n/2}$. Thus,

$$2^K \log K > \frac{n \log 2}{2} > \frac{n}{3}. \tag{6}$$

We now check that the above inequality implies that

$$2^K > \frac{n}{4 \log \log n}. \tag{7}$$

Indeed, assume that the reverse inequality (7) holds. Then,

$$2^K \leq \frac{n}{4 \log \log n},$$

giving

$$K \log 2 \leq \log n - \log 4 - \log \log \log n < \log n.$$

For the above right–hand side inequality, we used the fact that $n > 200 > e^e$, which implies that $\log \log \log n$ is positive. Thus,

$$K < \frac{\log n}{\log 2} < 2 \log n.$$

We now get that

$$2^K \log K < \frac{n \log(2 \log n)}{4 \log \log n}.$$

Using inequality (6), we have that

$$\frac{n}{3} < 2^K \log K < \frac{n \log 2}{4 \log \log n} + \frac{n}{4},$$

leading to $\log \log n < 3 \log 2$, which implies that $n < e^8 < 3000$. However, since $K \geq 15$ and P_n is odd, we have, by Lemma 2, that

$$2^{15} \mid 2^K \mid \phi(P_n) \mid P_n - 1 = P_{(n-\epsilon)/2} Q_{(n+\epsilon)/2}.$$

We observe that from Lemma 3, Q_n is never divisible by 4, so

$$2^{14} \mid P_{(n+1)/2} \quad \text{or} \quad 2^{14} \mid P_{(n-1)/2}.$$

Lemma 3 again implies that $2^{14} = 16384$ divides one of $(n+1)/2$ or $(n-1)/2$. This contradicts the fact that $n < 3000$. Thus, inequality (7) holds. Let q be any prime factor of P_n. Reducing relation

$$Q_n^2 - 8P_n^2 = 4(-1)^n \tag{8}$$

of Lemma 2 modulo q, we get $Q_n^2 \equiv -4 \pmod{q}$. Since q is odd, (because n is odd), we get that $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. This is true for all prime factors q of P_n. Hence,

$$2^{2K} \mid \phi(P_n) \mid P_n - 1 = P_{(n-\epsilon)/2} Q_{(n+\epsilon)/2}.$$

Since Q_n is never divisible by 4, we have that $2^{2K-1} \mid$ divides one $P_{(n+1)/2}$ or $P_{(n-1)/2}$. Hence, 2^{2K-1} divides one of $(n+1)/2$ or $(n-1)/2$. Using relation (7), we have that

$$\frac{n+1}{2} \geq 2^{2K-1} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{n}{4\log\log n}\right)^2.$$

This last inequality leads to

$$n^2 < 16(n+1)(\log\log n)^2,$$

giving that $n < 21$, a contradiction, which completes the proof of this theorem.

Acknowledgments

B. F. thanks OWSD and Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) for a scholarship during her Ph.D. studies at Wits.

References

[1] Banks, W.D. and F. Luca, "Composite integers n for which $\phi(n) \mid n-1$", *Acta Mathematica Sinica* **23** (2007), 1915–1918.
[2] P. Burcsi, S. Czirbusz, G. Farkas, "Computational Investigation of Lehmer Totient Problem", *Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest., Sect. Comp.* **35** (2011) 43–49.
[3] G. L. Cohen and P. Hagis, "On the number of prime factors of n if $\phi(n) \mid n-1$", *Nieuw Arch. Wisk. (3)* **28** (1980), 177–185.
[4] Dae-June Kim and Byeong-Kweon Oh, "Generalized Cullen numbers with the Lehmer Property", *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* **50** (2013), 1981–1988.
[5] B. Faye and F. Luca "Lucas numbers with the Lehmer property", *Preprint* 2015.
[6] J. M. Grau Ribas and F. Luca,"Cullen numbers with the Lehmer property", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **140** (2012), 129–134: "Corrigendum", idem, **141** (2013), 2941–2943.
[7] D.H. Lehmer "On Euler totient function", *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **38** (1932), 745–751.
[8] F. Luca "Fibonacci numbers with the Lehmer property", *Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math.* **55** (2007), 7–15.
[9] C. Pomerance, "On composite n for which $\phi(n) \mid n-1$, II", *Pacific J. Math.* **69** (1977), 177–186.
[10] Renze, J, "Computational evidence for Lehmer's totient conjecture", *Published electronically at http://library.wolfram.com/ infocenter/MathSource/5483/*, 2004.

Ecole Doctorale de Mathematiques et d'Informatique
Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar
BP 5005, Dakar Fann, Senegal
and
School of Mathematics, University of the Witwatersrand
Private Bag X3, Wits 2050, South Africa

E-mail address: bernadette@aims-senegal.org

School of Mathematics, University of the Witwatersrand
Private Bag X3, Wits 2050, South Africa

E-mail address: Florian.Luca@wits.ac.za